UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/309,161	05/10/1999	LAWRENCE CUI	OLAL1006.002	7164

23910	7590	08/26/2004

FLIESLER MEYER, LLP
FOUR EMBARCADERO CENTER
SUITE 400
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

EXAMINER
PAULA, CESAR B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 08/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 21 June 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

a) ☒ The period for reply expires _3_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.

2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:

   (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

   (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);

   (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

   (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
   NOTE: _____.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

5. ☒ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: *See Continuation Sheet*.

6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a)☐ will not be entered or b)☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

   The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

   Claim(s) allowed: _____.

   Claim(s) objected to: _____.

   Claim(s) rejected: *1-14*.

   Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.

10. ☐ Other: _____

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The examiner disagrees with applicants' statement that the specification teaches the storage of "these cookies" (stripped off cookies) in a cookie repository p.4,L.16-24, because the specification indicates that is "The cookies owned by a particular session and identdified by the session id are typically stored in a cookie repository" (p.3,L.2-3). Therefore, it would be unclear to one of ordinary skill in the art that the stripped off cookies is what is being stored in the repository.

Moreover, applicants note that the cookie handling function can be done using a repository as described by the summary of the invention p.5,L.1-13. The examiner disagrees with this argument, because the section of the summary of the invention quoted by the applicants only discloses solving the problem of of browsers which cannot handle cookies because of memory restriction. This section does not mention the storage of cookies in a cookie repository.

In addition, applicants state that none of the references teach stripping off cookies and then sending a modified pag to a elient p.6,L1-4). The examiner disagrees. Wagner discloses the deletion of cookies from web page headers sent to a user. The cookies are stored in a web server which introduces these cooldes into the header of a requested web page (col. 2, lines 1-67, co1.3, lines 1-67). Wagner fails to explicitly teach appending the session id to all ofthe finkç embedded in the responsepage and sending the modfed responsepage, with the ncw header. However, McGee discloses the appending of a user's session index or session id to all the URt,s embedded in a web pages (col.loylines 34-67, col.ll,lines 56-67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have appended the session id to the links in the web page, and combine the teachings of Wagner, and McGee, because McGee discloses a system where only authorized users can access web pages (co1.4, lines 43-67), so that the information would be safeguarded by providing it to valid users, and denying it to unauthorized users. Regarding independent claim 2, Warer discloses the requesting, and browsing of web pages from a web server by a web browser (col. 2, lines 1-67, col.3, lines 1-67). Wagner fails to explicitly teach generating a unique session id in response to a requestfrom a client browser. However, McGee discloses the generation of a user's session index or session id (col. 9, L. 1421, col.10,L.64-6).

Therefore, claims 1-14 stand rejected based at least on the explications set forth above.

CESAR B PAULA
PATENT EXAMINER
AU 2178
8/24/04